



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STAPFER ON THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.

By ALVAH HOVEY,
Newton Centre, Mass.

DR. EDMOND STAPFER is a professor in the faculty of Protestant theology of the university of Paris. He is the author of three volumes on the person, authority, and work of Jesus Christ, entitled respectively, *Jesus Christ before His Ministry*, *Jesus Christ during His Ministry*, and *The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ*.¹ This paper will reproduce and criticise some of his statements concerning the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

His introduction to the subject in question reads thus :

Up to this point, except in minor details, we have made no critical studies. We have almost exclusively confined ourselves to setting forth historic certainties. Side by side with this narrative of events we have had an *essentia. purpose, to learn what was going on in the soul of Jesus, what was the order of his thoughts before and during his ministry*.² This work is completed in the very imperfect degree in which it may be done. At present a study of an entirely different order is imposed upon us ; a minute study which the reader may consider as an appendix to our work, but a necessary appendix, since we have to treat of questions such as this : What took place during the days that followed the burial of Jesus, and what are we to understand by what is called his resurrection? (Pp. 186, 187.)

Dr. Stapfer then reminds his readers that the question is purely historical, it relates simply to a fact of the past, nothing more and nothing less, and it is to be established, if at all, according to the ordinary methods of historic criticism, as our age has brought them to light and made them potent ; . . . It is the more necessary to say this, because in no case has *a priori* been given freer course than in this question of the resurrection of Jesus.

He refers to the many as saying : " This must have happened ; " " It is altogether impossible that it did not take place ; " and remarks :

It is truly strange that men continually assume to know what must have taken place instead of seeking for what actually did take place ; and that they always conclude that facts must have been thus and so, instead of simply discovering what they were.

¹ Translated by Louise Seymour Houghton and published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1896, 1897, 1898. \$1.25 a volume.

² Italicized by the writer of this article.

This language has a familiar sound, and there must be many who deserve the reproof which it administers. Happy the critic who does not! But the practice thus condemned is more or less rational and necessary in order to any comprehension of events in the past. Many events are accepted as truly historical upon weak testimony, provided they are natural consequences of what preceded and natural antecedents of what followed. Circumstantial evidence is mostly of this kind, and everyone knows that it is often strong enough to compel belief. Indeed, it would be easy to show that Stapfer in divining the thoughts of Jesus at different crises of his life has done with a free hand what is here so strongly condemned.

It will assist us in understanding Dr. Stapfer's critical study of the evidence for the resurrection of Christ to know beforehand the conclusion which he reaches, namely, that all the manifestations of himself by Jesus to his disciples after his crucifixion were in reality spiritual apparitions, having no bodily substance behind them, and serving in no way to account for the disappearance of his dead body from the sepulcher. Yet Stapfer freely admits the absence of Christ's body from the sepulcher on the first day of the week :

There is not the slightest doubt that the tomb was empty on the morning of the third day after Jesus' death. What had happened? To this question the four gospel narratives are unanimous in replying that Jesus had returned to life, and that, having arisen from the dead, he appeared to a certain number of persons on the third day and the days following; but all four differ, and are even contradictory, as to the details.

These differences and contradictions are all accounted for by the following hypothesis :

The gospels are the echoes of two entirely distinct traditions. . . . According to one, the appearances of Jesus were all in Galilee; . . . according to the other, they took place in Jerusalem and its neighborhood. The Galilean tradition is reproduced in its oldest form in the gospels of Mark and Matthew. The last stage of its development known to us is set forth in the apocryphal gospel of Peter, discovered a few years ago.

Dr. Stapfer begins his account of the Galilean tradition by quoting at length the following passage from the apocryphal gospel of Peter :

In the night between Saturday and Sunday the soldiers who were guarding the tomb heard a great noise from heaven. They raised their eyes; the heavens were opened, and two shining angels descended from heaven and came to the sepulcher. The stone which served as a door rolled away of itself. The two angels entered the tomb, and the soldiers made haste to

awaken the captain and the elders of the Jews who were with them watching the tomb, but who had fallen asleep. While they were telling them what they had seen, behold, three men came forth from the tomb—that is, Christ supported by the two angels; the cross on which he had suffered followed them. The angels were so tall that their heads touched the sky. Jesus was taller still, and his head passed through the sky. A voice was heard from heaven, saying: “Hast thou preached to them who are asleep?” And a reply came from the cross, saying: “Yes.” The whole company ran to report the fact to Pilate. Meanwhile, at daybreak, Mary Magdalene came to the tomb, with several other women, to embalm the body. The angel had said to them, “He is risen and gone thither whence he was sent,” that is, to heaven.

Stapfer calls attention to the circumstance that this narrative puts the ascension immediately after the resurrection, no disciple having seen the Lord, though he conjectures (why I cannot see) that the lost conclusion of this apocryphal gospel of Peter related an appearance of Jesus on the shore of the Sea of Galilee. Possibly he felt that such an account was necessary in order to connect this story with what he calls the “Galilean tradition.” At all events, he expresses this opinion in a minute and critical study of evidence, without suggesting any ground for it. But how can one persuade himself to associate such a fantastic myth with the narratives of Mark and Matthew? And, especially, a scholar who does not refer in a single sentence to the last twelve verses of our present gospel of Mark?—though he does refer to “the lost ending of Mark,” which he thinks could not have contained any account of an appearance of Jesus to his disciples in Jerusalem.

He epitomizes the narrative of Mark in these sentences:

Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome went into the tomb, and saw there an angel, who announced to them the resurrection of Jesus and bade them inform Peter and the other apostles, telling them also that the risen Jesus would go before them into Galilee, where they should see him, as he had said.

This distinct announcement of an appearance of Jesus to his disciples in Galilee is probably the unnoticed ground of Stapfer’s conclusion that the lost ending of Mark’s gospel could not have mentioned any appearance of Christ to his friends in Jerusalem. But it is surely possible that Jesus may have made provision for a meeting in Galilee of such a nature as would necessitate some delay in notifying and bringing together his scattered and disheartened followers, although he intended meanwhile to make himself known to the Eleven and a few others in Jerusalem. The latter may have been almost necessary in order to bring about in a natural way the former.

Professor Stapfer next summarizes the narrative of Matthew :

Two women only [inserting without reason the word *only*], Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, came to see the sepulcher. An angel rolled the stone from the door of the sepulcher, sat upon it, and said to them : " Jesus is risen ; he goes before his disciples into Galilee, where they shall see him." And the women, far from saying nothing, as Mark affirms, ran to carry the news to his disciples. But on their way Jesus met them, and told them again that it was in Galilee they should see him. The Eleven therefore repaired to Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them (though there had not before been any allusion to a mountain).

By this last clause Stapfer flatly contradicts the statement of the first gospel ; for that gospel says, *εἰς τὸ ὄρος οὗ ἐτάξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς*—" to the mountain where Jesus had appointed them"—while the critic affirms that " there had not before been any allusion to a mountain." Observe also that he passes over in silence the record of Matthew that the women held Jesus by the feet when he met them, *ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας καὶ προσκύνησαν αὐτῷ*. Dr. Stapfer's summary closes by saying : " Jesus appeared to them [the disciples], and—a curious detail—some disciples doubted. . . . There Jesus addresses them, delivering to them the great commission ; and with this the gospel ends, saying nothing about the ascension."

Dr. Stapfer takes occasion at this point to rebuke conservative students who do not admit contradictions between these two narratives. But what are the contradictions which he himself notices ? The *first* pertains to the *number* of women who came early to the sepulcher. Mark names three, and Matthew two. But neither of them says that his list embraces the names of all who came. And surely the greater number may include the less, while the less does not exclude the greater. The assumption that either of the narratives gives the names of all who were there is simply gratuitous.—The *second* alleged contradiction relates to the *silence* of the women as to what they had seen and heard at the sepulcher. According to Mark, they said nothing to anyone as they fled from the sepulcher, because they were afraid ; but, according to Matthew, they departed quickly from the sepulcher with fear and great joy, and ran to tell his disciples. If we suppose that they were too excited and amazed to speak of what had occurred to anyone until they had found the disciples, full justice, and no more than justice, will be done to both the narratives. It is absurd to suppose that Mark intended to affirm that they *never* told anyone of what they had seen, and it is fair to say that Matthew implies an excitement and haste in their going to the disciples which would have been inconsistent with

their telling on the way what they had seen.—The *third* contradiction, if there be a third, in the mind of Stapfer, must relate to *the place* of rendezvous in Galilee. Mark speaks of that place as Galilee, that is, somewhere in Galilee, but Matthew speaks of it as at, or in, a certain appointed mountain of Galilee. Matthew is more definite in his specification of the place where the meeting was to be than Mark; but we are unable to discover any contradiction between the two.

Let us hear Stapfer again :

According to these narratives of the Galilean tradition, the risen Jesus, notwithstanding the interview mentioned in Matt. 28 : 9, appeared only in Galilee. More than this, it was not on the third day that he showed himself to his disciples; it was at least a week after the crucifixion that Peter and the other apostles saw Jesus.

To which I reply : According to these narratives of the Galilean tradition, Jesus appeared to his disciples, women included, once in Jerusalem and once in Galilee, twice and only twice — unless we accept the conjecture of our critic that the lost conclusion of the apocryphal gospel of Peter mentions some other appearance of Jesus to his disciples in Galilee. The hypothesis of a Galilean tradition in distinction from a Jerusalem tradition is therefore worthless.

Passing now to Dr. Stapfer's statement of the Jerusalem tradition, which he finds in Luke, it is substantially this :

Several women (of whom Mary of Magdala, Joanna, and Mary the mother of James are named) come to the tomb very early in the morning and find it empty. Two angels tell them of the resurrection, but without informing them where they are to meet their risen Lord. Returning from the tomb, they repeat what they had seen and heard to the Eleven and the rest, but their testimony is not believed. The same day Jesus joins himself with two disciples who were going to Emmaus, a village more than seven miles from Jerusalem. But they do not at first recognize him, and he bears himself as if he did not know why they were sad. He also makes as if he would go beyond the village, yet at their urgent request goes in to sup with them. Then at the breaking of bread their eyes are opened to recognize him, and he at once becomes invisible (*ἀφαντος*). Upon this the two disciples return speedily to Jerusalem, find the Eleven, listen to their declaration that Jesus was risen and had appeared to Simon, and report to the company what they had seen on the way and at the breaking of bread. Presently Jesus appears among them, and the disciples believe him to be a spirit, but he shows them his hands and feet, and reminds them that a spirit has not flesh and bones, as they behold him having. He also asks : Have ye anything to eat? And they give him a piece of broiled fish, which he takes and eats before them.

Then he leads them to Bethany (all this apparently in the same evening of Sunday, the first day of the week) and disappears while in the act of blessing them.

Thus, according to Luke, as interpreted by Stapfer, there were no appearances in Galilee. All took place in Jerusalem, or its immediate neighborhood. Yet he admits that the writer of the Acts, whom he does not deny to be Luke, represents Jesus as appearing unto the apostles by the space of forty days before he was taken up. This fact, however, appears to have no influence on his interpretation of the particle *καὶ* which introduces the last paragraph of Luke's gospel. Yet it is not necessary to suppose that Luke meant to affirm by the word *καὶ* an immediate temporal connection between the narrative of Christ's appearing to the Eleven with others in Jerusalem, and the narrative of his leading them out as far as Bethany to witness his ascension. Says Dr. Plummer in the *International Critical Commentary*:

While he (Luke) does not state either here or in vs. 44 that there was any interval at all, still less does he say that there was none. But it is incredible that he can mean that, late at night (vss. 29, 33), Jesus led them out to Bethany and ascended in the dark. So remarkable a feature would hardly have escaped notice.

It may properly be added that, although Luke's narrative of Christ's interview with two disciples on their way to Emmaus, of his appearing to Simon Peter, of his eating a piece of broiled fish, and of his reference to his flesh and bones, offers us distinct additions to the facts related by Matthew and Mark—omitting the last twelve verses of Mark—it is in substantial agreement with theirs, in so far as the same events are recorded (*e. g.*, the presence of the women at the sepulcher and what followed). None of the differences are contradictions. They are such as might be expected in brief, independent accounts of remarkable events.

Stapfer avers that the fourth gospel combines the two traditions found in the synoptics, and epitomizes it in the following manner:

This gospel tells how Mary Magdalene went alone to the sepulcher on the morning of the third day and found it empty; how she ran to apprise Peter and the other disciples whom Jesus loved; how they ran to the tomb and ascertained that the body of Jesus was no longer there; how they went away and Mary remained alone, while two angels, and then Jesus himself, appeared to her, though forbidding her to touch him; how in the evening of the same day he appeared to the apostles, Thomas being absent; and how he appeared to them again a week later, inviting Thomas to touch his hands and his side. A supplementary chapter, added to the gospel at a later time, shows us Jesus

taking a meal with seven of his disciples on the shore of Galilee, putting to Peter three times the question, *Lovest thou me?* and renewing his commission to serve as an apostle.

Of this narrative in the fourth gospel Stapfer says very little; first, because he believes it to be a late and composite story, and, secondly, because he esteems its authorship post-apostolic. Yet in most respects it bears the impress of originality. The narrative is singularly graphic. The conduct of Peter and John, the interview of Jesus with Mary Magdalene, his appearances in a room whose doors were shut for fear of the Jews, the bearing and language of Thomas, and the scene on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, are illustrations of this. The style suggests a writer who had his knowledge at first hand, and not from traditional sources. And the fourth gospel is remarkable for limiting its story of Jesus' life, for the most part, to events which the writer had witnessed.

It is perhaps worthy of notice that Dr. Stapfer represents the fourth gospel as saying that Mary of Magdala went *alone* to the sepulcher, even as he represents Matthew as saying that two women *only* went early to the tomb. In this case, as well as in that, his language adds to the text. The narrative in John does not forbid us to believe that other women accompanied the Magdalen to the sepulcher. It is necessary to protest against such modern glosses being brought into an epitome of the original, especially when they increase the difficulty of reconciling the several accounts.

But there may be a third and deeper reason why Stapfer treats so briefly the post-resurrection story of the fourth gospel. It strongly supports the view that the risen Christ had, in some proper and real sense, the same body which was laid in Joseph's tomb, though, of course, wondrously changed. This Stapfer does not believe to be true, and therefore, it may be presumed, treats very briefly the records which either affirm or imply it. Observe his words concerning the two traditions which he supposed to be mingled in the fourth gospel: "According to the Galilean tradition, the risen One had but a fugitive life, and made only brief appearances" (two in all, one to the women and one to the Eleven). "According to the Jerusalem tradition, on the contrary, the life of the risen One was the continuance, pure and simple, of his earthly life." (!!) But, as if startled by this extravagant statement, he proceeds at once to qualify it thus:

No doubt there are two points of difference. Jesus was not constantly present and was not always recognizable. He could be instantly transported

from place to place; he appeared and disappeared; but he had the very body which had been put into the tomb. . . . This body, this physical organism, had become alive again; it ate and drank and walked. The risen Jesus had interviews with his apostles just as before. The Jerusalem form of the tradition became ever more affirmative as to the materialization of the body of Jesus. When the apostles saw Jesus the first time they thought they saw a spirit (Luke 24:27). But Jesus spoke to them; he replied in advance to their objections, and finally he ate before them. This continuation of the Master's life with his friends lasted precisely forty days. Then the material body of Jesus was detached from earth and rose toward heaven, the abode of God, who is overhead in the blue sky, above the clouds.

Little comment is here necessary. Yet the writer emphasizes unduly the sameness of Christ's risen body with that which was laid in Joseph's sepulcher. Christ evidently treated it as somewhat changed. Luke's narrative does not give the impression that it was in all respects what it was before the resurrection. Again, why is the precise period of forty days noted by Stapfer, as if it needed explanation? Or why does he call attention to the circumstance that heaven is conceived of as overhead in the blue sky, above the clouds? There is no mention of forty days or of the cloud which received him out of their sight in the gospel according to Luke. And if the testimony of Luke in the Acts is to be employed, much more is to be considered than these two statements. This will be evident, if we study another remark of Stapfer's:

Not one of the four evangelists says: "I have seen the risen One; he appeared unto me." On the contrary, all four bring only indirect testimony—the statement of others, not their own experience. And so far as St. John is concerned, if he is the author of the fourth gospel, this is most extraordinary. He, like the others, knows of the resurrection of Jesus only by hearsay, and gives us only the testimony of others, especially of Mary Magdalene. It is true that he relates the appearances to the Eleven, and, being one of the Eleven, he was present. But why does he not say: "I was there"?

This is an astonishing passage. Matthew was an apostle, and he asserts, as if to meet this criticism, that "the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And seeing him they worshiped him; but some doubted." If Matthew was the writer of the first gospel, he virtually affirms that Jesus appeared unto himself, with others. He does not report mere "hearsays." To have distinguished himself from the rest by saying, "I was there," would have been inconsistent with the modest brevity of the gospel.

Again, it is highly probable that the gospel according to Mark is a faithful report of the apostle Peter's preaching ; and, if the last twelve verses of this gospel were clearly genuine, I should appeal to the fourteenth verse as Peter's testimony that Jesus "was manifested to the eleven as they reclined at table." But as this cannot be done, I may safely appeal to his own words, as reported by Luke in the Acts (2 : 32): "This Jesus has God raised up, of which we are all witnesses," the "we all" meaning the apostles. Add to this another declaration: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, hanging him on a tree. Him did God exalt as a Prince and a Savior, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins. And we are witnesses of these things" (5 : 30, 31). This seems to be unambiguous language, especially when we place it beside Peter's words in Acts 1 : 21, 22: "It is necessary, therefore, that of the men who accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day when he was received up from us—of these one should become a witness with us of his resurrection." "*A witness with us of his resurrection!*" We must, therefore, impeach the credibility of Luke as a historian, or admit that Peter was wont to class himself publicly with the witnesses of Christ's resurrection. But Stapfer appears to have overlooked the testimony of these passages in his critical study of the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus.

Again, he thinks it *most extraordinary* that John omits to say in so many words: "Jesus appeared to me." But there was no occasion for John to mention himself personally, since he gives two instances in which Christ appeared to his disciples "when the doors were shut"—once when Thomas was absent, and a second time when he was present with the rest. If Jesus had appeared to John—as he did to Peter, to James, to Mary Magdalene, and to Paul—when no other disciples were present, he might perhaps have been expected to mention the fact, but, even then, his failure to do this could not have been justly pronounced "most extraordinary." It would have been in harmony with his modest bearing in connection with Peter, as suggested by the first part of the Acts.

Dr. Stapfer speaks with greater respect of Paul's testimony:

Here there is a witness who fulfils the conditions generally required of a witness: his attestation is contained in an undisputed letter; and not only does he affirm the resurrection like the others, but he writes in so many words: "He appeared to me also" (*ὡφθη καὶ μοι*). Such testimony as this is very different from all that we have hitherto collected. All the others . . . are, without exception, merely hearsays. . . . We have only the words of Paul. . . .

St. Paul's conviction was wholly based upon the perfectly clear recollection which he cherished of all that took place upon the road to Damascus.

Does the apostle anywhere affirm this? We think not. The appearance of Jesus to him may have been no more than the last straw which broke the camel's back of his unbelief. If his conviction of the resurrection of Christ was "wholly based" on his recollection of that appearance, why in the world does he not say so, instead of asserting with just as much positiveness his appearance to Cephas, to the Twelve, to above five hundred brethren at once, to James, and again to all the apostles, before saying, "last of all, as if to one born out of due time, to me also he appeared" (1 Cor. 15: 5-8)? He must have regarded the testimony of the others as worth no less, one by one, than his own.

Stapfer also assures us, absolutely, that "Paul saw no differences between the appearances of Jesus to the Twelve and the one with which he had been favored. He treats them all as precisely the same." This, however, seems to be an overstatement of the case. Certainly he regarded them all as equally real and objective appearances, proving the resurrection of Christ. But there is no reason to suppose that he imagined them all alike, as, *e. g.*, that a light above the brightness of the sun attended them all.

But Stapfer takes a more dangerous position, maintaining that Paul did not see Jesus himself when the latter appeared to him on his way to Damascus. In support of this denial he alleges, *first*, that "in none of the narratives of Paul's conversion given in the Acts is it said that he saw Jesus; he was dazzled, he was blinded, he heard a voice, but he neither saw nor touched the Being who appeared to him." This likewise appears to be an exaggeration of the lack of evidence against his own view. The accounts of Paul's conversion in the Acts may not prove beyond the possibility of doubt that Paul saw the very person of Jesus; much less do they prove that he did not see him as a person. The words of Acts 9: 7, that "the men who journeyed with him were standing speechless, hearing the voice, but beholding no one," seem to imply that Saul both heard and saw Jesus. So likewise do the words of Ananias, as repeated by Paul in Acts 22: 14, 15, 16: "The God of our fathers has appointed thee to know his will, and to *see the Righteous One*, and to hear a voice out of his mouth. For thou shalt be a witness for him to all men, of what thou hast seen and heard." This language is a part of Luke's report of Paul's account of his conversion, addressed to the people from the stairs of the castle in Jerusalem, and it represents him as *having seen the Righteous One*.

It may, indeed, be thought that Luke or Paul had forgotten the *verba ipsissima* of Ananias. But no one knows this to have been the case. Certainly Paul would not have been likely to make Ananias testify of his having seen the Righteous One, unless he himself remembered seeing him. The chance of error is therefore limited to Luke's report of Paul's speech. But we are not restricted to the Acts for evidence as to the point in question. In his first epistle to the Corinthians (9:1) Paul asks: "Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen the Lord?"—questions the last of which is accounted for by the fact that to have seen the risen Lord was deemed essential to the work or authority of an apostle. This has been previously shown by reciting the words of Peter at the choice of Matthias to fill the place vacated by the death of Judas (see also John 15:27).

In support of his contention that Paul did not see Jesus as an external person, Stapfer appeals, *secondly*, to the language of Gal. 1:16, interpreting "appeared to me" by "revealed his Son in me." The passage in Galatians beginning with vs. 15 may be literally rendered: "But when he, who set me apart from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, was pleased to reveal his Son in me, that I should make known the glad news of him among the Gentiles, straightway I did not confer with flesh and blood," etc. Is Stapfer right in assuming or asserting that Paul meant the same by God's "revealing his Son in me," and by Christ's "appearing to me" (*καὶ μοι ὤφθη*), or, my "having seen Christ"? We think not. Later on in the epistle to the Galatians he writes thus: "I have been crucified with Christ, and I live no longer myself, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me" (2:20). This indwelling and revelation of Christ in the soul of Paul began no doubt with his conversion on the way to Damascus, but it was continued through all his ministry. The objective manifestation to sight and hearing was momentary, though indubitable to him, but the subjective and gracious presence of Christ by his spirit was permanent, illuminating, inspiring, the supreme qualification for the most important part of his work, preaching a full gospel to the Gentiles. It was more than the passing vision which was given him near Damascus, and in one passage Stapfer uses language that approaches what I think to be the full sense of the words, "revealed his Son in me." "In the apostle's experience, to the exterior vision which dazzled his sight there was a corresponding inner revelation of which his soul was the theater." But he fails to say that the latter was continuous, while the former was not.

This brings us to the result which is reached by our author as to the nature of Christ's resurrection. Observe what he writes:

He arose on the third day, [but] it was not the flesh that formerly lived that returned to life; it was a spiritual and celestial body, *coming forth from the material and earthly body* which died on the cross.

Hence the earthly body was not removed from the tomb by the resurrection. What became of it no one but God can tell. The possibilities of its removal are made the most of by Dr. Stapfer, but they do not amount to probabilities. He relies, however, upon Paul, and especially upon his discussion of the subject in 1 Cor., chap. 15, for the support of his hypothesis. And he gives such an interpretation to several expressions in this chapter as makes them favorable to that hypothesis. The most important expressions are these: (1) "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" (2) "It is sown a psychical body, it is raised a spiritual body;" and (3) the use of *σῶμα* as the regular and almost technical term for Christ's manifestation of himself to his disciples and to Paul.

1. Meaning of the expression: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." "The kingdom of God" here signifies his heavenly kingdom, and the context shows plainly enough that the apostle refers by the words "flesh and blood" to animal bodies which are adapted to our present earthly state, which are corruptible, and which therefore are unfit for the heavenly life. Such a psychical organism as we now have, notoriously weak and perishable, cannot partake of celestial glory. But this surely need not be understood as equivalent to a denial of anything material in our resurrection bodies. How little do we know concerning the possibilities of bodily organization!

2. Meaning of the expression: "It is sown a psychical body, it is raised a spiritual body." On this statement Dr. Stapfer relies with the greatest confidence, averring that "in Paul's mind the body of the risen Christ was made of the substance of the *πνεῦμα*." But how can he be certain of this? Neither the meaning of the adjective, nor the meaning of the noun, nor the meaning of the antithetic adjective *ψυχικόν*, renders this interpretation unquestionable. If Paul intends to teach that the body of every risen saint will be made of the same substance as his *πνεῦμα*, he must also intend to teach that the present body of every Christian is made of the same substance as his *ψυχή*, or soul—a doctrine not easily adjusted to his use of *σῶμα* and *ψυχή* elsewhere. The adjectives seem to refer rather to the functions than to the substance of the two kinds of body. Professor Gould translates the next

verse: "If there is a psychical body, there is also a spiritual," and interprets it thus: "The apostle says: If there is a body for the soul, or lower part, there must be one for the spirit, or higher part. . . . It is assumed here, as in the discussions of the resurrection, that the body is necessary to the completeness of man, the human spirit being adapted to a bodily organism, and incomplete without it." According to Dr. Thayer's *Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, the word *ψυχή* often signifies *life*, especially life in its present or earthly form. It is, therefore, natural to suppose that Paul uses the adjective *ψυχικόν* with *σῶμα* in this place to denote a body subservient to the present life of man, while he uses the word *πνευματικόν* with *σῶμα* to denote a body subservient in a higher degree to the future and endless life of man. This interpretation is recommended by the fact that it leaves to the word *σῶμα* an intelligible sense in both clauses of the verse, especially the second, and also that it leaves men in their eternal state still related to the seen as well as to the unseen universe. For this seems to me a great advantage. I should not like to lose forever the sight and sense of material objects. But Stapfer insists that it "does not suffice to say: the natural body [of Christ] was transformed into a spiritual body; for this has no meaning. Everything is changed, as we well know, but nothing is lost, and matter can only be transformed into matter." Very well; we do not hold that matter is ever changed into spirit, or spirit into a body, but only that matter can be made a more supple and perfect organ of spirit than it now is, that it may be made to move with the swiftness of light and the power of electricity at the indwelling spirit's behest, and that it may be molded into forms of beauty expressive of moral goodness and grace beyond anything we see on earth. Let such a body be incorruptible, and it would go far to fulfil the language of Paul in respect to it.

Yet when we recur to the gospel narratives of the risen Christ, a difficulty emerges into view. If Jesus partook of food, as Luke affirms, must he not have been provided with organs of digestion in his risen body? And must not that body have been crescent and perhaps corruptible? The force of this objection is great, but I am not sure that we know enough of the possibilities of physical organization to say that it is irresistible. There is no evidence, except this one instance of eating, that Jesus *needed* food for the support of life and vigor during the forty days between his resurrection and ascension. His motive for taking it on this occasion appears to have been to convince his disciples that he was not a mere spirit, but their risen

Lord. Was this disingenuous, if he needed no food, and partook of it for a moral reason only? Did he partake of the broiled fish to show them that his body was *wholly* unchanged, so that it *required* food as of old, or only that it was so far a real body that he could partake of food? Something must depend on the effect of his other appearances on their minds. If they were of such a nature as to impress them with the fact that his risen body held very different relations to his spirit and way of living from those which his earlier body held, the effect of his various appearances might have been truthful. The resultant lesson respecting his resurrection body might have been as true to the reality as anything could have been. I do not know that an incorruptible body may not increase by the appropriation and transformation of material substances, without rejecting any part of what is appropriated. And it seems to me dangerous to deny the truth of Luke's record in this case because we are unable to explain the event in a scientific manner.

3. Stapfer defends his view of Christ's appearances as purely spiritual by claiming that the only word used to denote the resurrection is *ᾠφθῆ*. It ought to be so, if his theory were correct, for Jesus as a spiritual being existed in the same way from the hour of his crucifixion and simply appeared to some of his disciples now and then. But, as a matter of fact, it is never used to express the idea of resurrection. It simply affirms that the already risen One manifested himself to the sight of his friends. The same act is described in the gospel of John by the words *ἐφάνηρῶσεν ἑαυτόν*. The words used to denote the act or fact of resurrection are, of course, *ἀνίστημι* or *ἐγείρω*, *ἀνάστασις* and *ἔγερσις*.

Permit me to recall at this point a somewhat characteristic word of Stapfer :

It is hard to believe how many petty manipulations, forced texts, one-sided explanations, we find among the conservatives; arguments of which in the secret of their souls they cannot but feel the weakness and nothingness, and which, taken all in all, are miserable failures.

"O wad some power the giftie gie us
To see ourselves as others see us;
It would from money a blunder free us
And foolish notion."

For I know of no belated conservative who has given to the public, these many years past, a more one-sided and incomplete examination of evidence than that which our author has presented to us in the

last part of his work on Jesus Christ. He seems to have reached a settled prejudgment against any evidence which tends to show that Christ's actual body was raised and at the same time changed. Hence it counts for nothing with him that Paul speaks of a "redemption of the body" as certain to be effected, and, classing himself with living Christians, says: "We shall not all sleep (or die), but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed" (1 Cor. 15 : 51, 52; *cf.* Rom. 8 : 23); where evidently the change expected relates to the present corruptible body which is to be made incorruptible, the present body being ancillary to human life here, and the future body ancillary to human life in the world to come.

Having criticised freely Dr. Stapfer's discussion of the evidence concerning the reality and the nature of Christ's resurrection, it will be no more than just to say that the literary qualities of his work are of a high order, reminding one often of Renan's *Life of Jesus*. Such a style seems to be easy and breezy, though it may have cost patient labor to acquire it. A reader is likely to be charmed with it, even when he doubts whether it is suited to close argumentation. Again, Dr. Stapfer holds very firmly that Jesus actually appeared to some of his disciples after his crucifixion. These appearances were not mental illusions or hallucinations. He does not express any opinion as to the frequency or long continuance of such spiritual apparitions, but concedes the reality of them, and regards them as valid evidence of the Savior's life after death. At this point he differs radically from Renan. Still further, our critic gives evidence of being an earnest Christian. He recognizes the lordship of Jesus Christ, and expresses the deepest interest in his kingdom and confidence in its triumphant progress. In all this we rejoice, but in spite of it we must seriously criticise his interpretation of New Testament evidence as to the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

Professor Stapfer declares, as has been quoted, that "in no case has *a priori* been given freer course than in this question of the resurrection of Jesus." Presumably he has in mind the treatment of it by conservative scholars. It may be well, then, to test the value of his assertion by giving a brief résumé of the biblical evidence of Christ's resurrection from a conservative point of view. And we shall begin with the words of Paul, not because the result will depend upon the order of inquiry, but because his words are accepted by Stapfer as the earliest written testimony.

From the apostle's language in 1 Cor. 15:3-8 we learn that he believed, and was accustomed to teach, that Christ died for our sins, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day, that he appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve, then to above five hundred at once, then to James, then to all the apostles, and last of all to Paul himself. This record calls for two explanatory remarks. (1) It does not limit the appearances of Jesus Christ to the six instances here named. Paul does not say that the risen Christ appeared *first* to Cephas; he may have appeared to Mary of Magdala and to the other women before showing himself to Cephas. Nor does the connective *then* (ἐπειτα), which he uses in adding one appearance to another, prove that manifestations of himself other than those specified were not made between his appearance to Peter and his appearance, last of all, to Paul. (2) The language of Paul does not prove that his knowledge of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ was derived from a single source. It was a knowledge as to certain facts of vital importance to Christians which he had *received* and had *delivered* to the believers in Corinth. His language implies that the testimony of witnesses, or the events affirmed by them, had been compared by him with the Scriptures, and had been confirmed by what he saw and heard on the way to Damascus. Moreover, it is probable that the Spirit of Christ had given him inward assurance of the Lord's resurrection, as a fundamental truth of his gospel. This may be naturally inferred from his words in Gal. 1:12 and Rom. 9:1.

We now turn from the words of Paul to those of his companion, Luke. In the gospel according to Luke two appearances of Jesus are described with some fulness—one of them to two disciples who were walking to Emmaus, and the other to the Eleven with others in Jerusalem—while an appearance to Simon is mentioned as having taken place before the evening of the day on which he was raised, and a brief account of his visible separation from the disciples near Bethany is also related—four manifestations in all being noticed. A little later he says in the Acts that Jesus “showed himself alive to his apostles after his passion by many proofs, appearing unto them by the space of forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God.” He also speaks of a particular meeting with his disciples in Jerusalem, perhaps of two, and of his being taken up and a cloud receiving him out of their sight. Moreover, in the ninth chapter of the Acts he represents Barnabas as bringing Paul to the apostles in Jerusalem and “declaring to them how he [Paul] had seen the Lord in

the way, and been spoken to by him." He likewise represents Peter as testifying to Cornelius that "God raised Jesus the third day, and gave him to be made manifest, not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God, even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead" (10:40, 41). Again, he represents Paul as testifying to the people of Antioch in Pisidia that "God raised him (Jesus) from the dead, and he was seen for many days of them that came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now witnesses unto the people." Finally, as we have before shown, Luke represents Paul as reporting by the following words the message of Ananias to him in Damascus: "The God of our fathers has appointed thee to know his will, and to see the Righteous One, and to hear a voice from his mouth" (Acts 22:14). Now, it is difficult to believe that so intelligent and upright a man as Luke appears to have been should have misrepresented the teaching of either Peter or Paul concerning the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. And it is equally difficult to believe that he could have failed to understand the testimony of Paul, and the other apostles whom he met, about the appearances of Jesus to his friends.

In studying the gospel narratives, it should be borne in mind that we do not know where the apostles or the women spent the two nights after the Lord's crucifixion. Some of them, John and Peter for example, may have lodged in the city not far from Golgotha. Others may have lodged in the suburbs, as far away as Bethany, and perhaps in different places. Fear of the Jews may have led them to separate localities, so that not more than two or three would be found together. Again, we do not know that all the women started at the same time on the first day of the week for the sepulcher, or that they arrived there together. Finally, we do not know that in giving the time of their coming to the sepulcher all the evangelists had reference to the moment of their arrival there. Some of them may have given the time when they left their lodgings to visit the tomb, and others the time when they came in sight of it. Thus Matthew says that, "as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to see the sepulcher." Mark says that "very early on the first day of the week Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Salome came to the tomb when the sun was risen." Luke says that "on the first day of the week at early dawn Mary Magdalene and Joanna and Mary the mother of James came unto the tomb." And John says that "on the first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early,

while it was yet dark, to the tomb." We may infer from these various expressions that some time before sunrise a part or all of the women left their lodgings, and that when the last of them arrived at Joseph's tomb the rays of the morning sun had touched the mountain-tops around Jerusalem. The criticism which finds any necessary contradiction between these statements seems to us scarcely generous or just. If they started from different points, they probably started at slightly different times, and afterward described their coming to the tomb in a general way, without intending to fix the precise moment when they reached their destination. Mary Magdalene may have been first at the sepulcher, though John does not affirm this, and Jesus may have appeared to her first, though only the appendix to Mark affirms this. Were it not for this assertion of Mark 16:9, it would be natural to suppose that Jesus met the other women while Mary of Magdala was running to inform Peter and John of what she had seen at the sepulcher; and that he afterward manifested himself to the Magdalen when Peter and John had left the garden by the tomb, returning to the city.

But even if we accept the statements of the last verses of Mark as equal in value to any part of that gospel, or of any other gospel, we need not see any contradiction between the evangelists as to the number or order of Christ's appearances.

For, in the first place, Peter and John may have lodged in the city within a rapid walk of five or a run of three minutes from the sepulcher. This might have been the case whether the tomb was at the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre or near the Hill of Stoning outside the Damascus gate. As Mary ran to inform the two apostles what she had seen and heard, and as they thereupon ran swiftly to the tomb, the time consumed need not have been more than twelve minutes, possibly less, and the distance thirty or forty rods, going and coming. If, then, we allow five minutes for the inspection of the tomb by the apostles and their going away, and three minutes for Mary's look into it and interview with Jesus, a quarter, or at most a third, of an hour had passed since Mary was first at the tomb. And if the other women left the sepulcher when Mary ran to tell Peter and John, they might have gone more than a mile toward the lodging places of the other apostles. But if their lodgings were in Bethany, or even somewhat nearer, there was ample time for Jesus to meet them before they reached their destination. It is, of course, assumed that he could pass from one place to another with marvelous celerity.

But while there is no great difficulty in seeing that Jesus might have met the women before they reached the disciples (except Peter and John), and after his appearing to Mary in the garden, it is urged by some (though not by Stapfer), as a further objection to the truth of Matt. 28:9, 10, that, according to Luke 24:22, 23, the two disciples, going to Emmaus, make no reference to this meeting of Christ with the women, though they say: "Moreover, certain women of our company amazed us, having been early at the tomb; and when they found not his body, they came, saying that they had also seen a vision of angels, who said that he was alive." This objection is plausible, but not convincing. To reject a clear statement of fact because it is not accompanied by another statement of fact, equally important, is hypercritical; especially in such a case as this, where it is natural to suppose that the two disciples may not have reported all that the women said, or that Luke may not have reported all that the two disciples said. The gospels are fragmentary narratives from first to last.

According to the conservative view, the appearances of Jesus to his friends must have been nearly in the following order: (1) to Mary of Magdala, (2) to several women from Galilee, (3) to Simon Peter, (4) to Cleopas and another disciple, (5) to all the apostles, except Thomas, (6) to the apostles, with Thomas, (7) to seven apostles on the shore of Galilee, (8) to above five hundred at a certain mountain of Galilee, (9) to the apostles in Jerusalem and near Bethany, and (10) to Saul on his way to Damascus. The order of the two appearances in Galilee (7 and 8) may be reversed without affecting in the slightest degree the trustworthiness of the narratives.